

more restrictive of your tribal rights and traditions and heritages than the legislation presently before us?

Mr. OLSON. That is correct. We, of course, recognize as Public Law 280 presently stands, the State could adopt a constitutional revision. It would require in our case a constitutional revision by the State of New Mexico. But they could do this, and assume such jurisdiction. It is for this reason that, of course, in the statement I think you will note that we do endorse title III of S. 1843.

Mr. MEEDS. I notice you are in favor of that.

Assuming that it was an all-or-nothing matter, however, and that the situation—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, just a minute. I do not want the gentleman to get this group of witnesses into the position that they have to testify as to all or nothing. I made a statement before the gentleman came that we were going to follow the orderly legislative process. And anything that has to do with blindfolding and shutting up the mouth of one of the coordinate bodies of Congress is not looked upon with favor by the chairman.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I think I should be free to pursue by line of questioning. I have legitimate interests in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. You can go ahead. But this meeting is to assume that we have jurisdiction of a bill that came to us legally, according to our procedures.

Mr. MEEDS. That is very true, Mr. Chairman. But the situation that I am describing may well arise. And I think we are entitled to an answer on that question.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I think the witnesses know how to answer the question now. Go ahead.

Mr. MEEDS. Assuming that the situation should arise that the situation should be that it is all or nothing, would it be the testimony of this group that they would rather have nothing—that is to say, a repeal of Public Law 280, and the other things that go with—that you do fear in this legislation?

Mr. OLSON. If I may answer the question like this—and I would prefer that this question be directed to some of the Indian people that will later testify.

Certainly we would hate to have to make a choice, because the Pueblos of New Mexico do not like Public Law 280, but they do not like the Civil Rights of 1843 as it is presently written. I would guess, after long and serious deliberation, that the All Indian Pueblo Council, the Pueblos of which it is composed, would take this position in relation to that. If they had to make a choice, they feel that S. 1843 is going to destroy them, they would say "No"—if it is all or nothing at all, we will take nothing at all. We would rather live with Public Law 280 as it presently stands and accept the provisions of S. 1843.

Mr. MEEDS. Now—

The CHAIRMAN. Would my colleague yield at this point. You have had the Sword of Damocles hanging over your head since 1954, is that correct? It has not bothered you to date.

Mr. OLSON. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. How many people do you represent—how many Indians?

Mr. OLSON. Approximately 30,000. Perhaps a few in addition to 30,000.